

doi: 10.18720/SPBPU/2/id19-115

TRAVKINA Ekaterina

*The Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, student,
Russia, St. Petersburg, 191186, Moika river embankment, 48;
e-mail: ektravkina95@gmail.com*

FEDOROV Alexander

*The Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia, student,
Russia, St. Petersburg, 191186, Moika river embankment, 48;
e-mail: AlexSerFedorov@yandex.ru*

INTERNATIONAL CONFRONTATION OF THE USA IN THE ARCTIC REGION

***Abstract.** The history of the development of the Arctic is a process of joint efforts of northern countries. Each country contributed to the research. The Arctic is a region with harsh climatic conditions, where a person feels defeated by nature. Today, the Arctic is rich in energy resources and its development is not as difficult as it used before. The international community is waiting for a decisive action. States are fighting to dominate in the Arctic region. The countries that do not belong to northern region have already entered the race, more than eight participants. Today, China has its own national interests in the Arctic. America is the leader on the world stage, and it intends to defend its military presence in this region. Military strategy and confrontation are the main instruments of US policy. Russia is the main rival of the USA in the Arctic territory. All other participants can be neutralized by NATO pressure. The USA has a small part of the territories in the Arctic, but the US has a lot of ambitions in this region. America cannot take a passive approach being the leader on the world stage and its status must be kept in check in the Arctic territories. The US policy in the Arctic is not certain, but due to the strengthening of Russia's influence in the Arctic macroregion, the United States has to react, and react only aggressively. The history of the Arctic braces back the purchase of Alaska. The US needs new energy resources; the Americans understand that the war for their possession has begun.*

***Keywords:** arctic, confrontation, partnership, united states, arctic territories, macroregion, declarations, national interests, natural resources, security.*

The international community, States and transnational companies have a lot of reasons for cooperation, but they have reasons for confrontation. The Arctic, as an independent region, has become another reason to play ahead of schedule. The Arctic is the Northern part of the globe, which occupies one sixth of the entire earth's surface. It is not secret that today the Arctic is considered a promising region. The urgency to develop the development of the Arctic region is due to the following factors:

- 1) it has large natural resources; hydrocarbon reserves are in priority.
- 2) the region has significant perspective in the development of sea transport routes.

3) in domination in the Arctic is a national security of the Arctic States.

4) the Arctic is a unique natural object, strongly affected by human activities and in need of reliable protection.

5) climate change facilitates the exploration and development of the Arctic. We can talk endlessly about the importance and relevance of studying and advancing the Arctic region, but we will focus on these points.

The development of the Arctic began 10 thousand years ago. The first wave of European colonization started in the 15th century. Denmark, Norway, Finland developed new territories [1]. Russia was beginning to explore the Northern territories, too. The 17th century was a century of strategic discoveries in the Arctic. Martin Frobisher, John Davis, Henry Hudson, William Buffin and Willem Barents became researchers of the time.

The starting point of the USA's entry into the circle of nations interested in the Arctic region is the sale of Alaska by the Russian Empire to the USA in 1867. Andre's brothers tried to climb in a balloon in 1897, but they died tragically. Richard Byrd and Floyd Bennett flew over the North pole in 1926. George Hubert Wilkins flew from Alaska to Spitsbergen in 1928. Britain, Holland, Norway, the USSR, Canada and America sent many field expeditions to learn more about the Arctic in 1937-1938. The United States and Russia have established a drifting observation stations on ice floes for the purpose of strengthening scientific research since 1954. The warning system was created by the United States in 1993. Nuclear submarines were used for navigation in the Arctic waters. The Nautilus was the first nuclear-powered submarine of the U.S. Navy to cross the North pole under the sea in 1958. The submarine skate was the first boat to float at the North pole in 1960. The Arctic became a place of intensive exploration of mineral and natural resources in the 1960s. [2]. The researchers found reserves of oil in Alaska in 1968 and the island of Ellesmere in 1972. These reserves led to intensive oil exploration in other places. The Manhattan steamship was designed to search for oil and became the first icebreaker to function as an Oceanographic research vessel. Scientists discovered a hole in the ozone layer over the Arctic in 1986. Scientists are observing a decrease in the ice cover in the Arctic and this has caused interest in the resources that have been discovered [3].

The main players in the Arctic region, the division into sectors and reasons. The legal protection of US interests in the Arctic region depends on a clear understanding of the international regime in Arctic macroregion and in the further use of its main provisions in government activities from a practical point of view. International legal acts have different interpretations of the Arctic region. For example, «Canada has defined its Arctic region comprising all the lands North of the parallel of 60

degrees including coastal areas of the Hudson and James bays. The Islands of Greenland and Faroe Islands belong to the Arctic region approved by the national legislation of Denmark» [4]. The United States refers to its Arctic territories that, extend to the North from the Arctic circle, areas of the Arctic ocean, and the Bering sea. Arctic States " are two groups of States. In the first group is of five States has direct interaction with the Arctic region (Denmark, the United States, Russia, Canada, Norway), "the coast of which goes to the Arctic ocean, which has, in accordance with the Geneva conventions of 1958 [5] on the definition of Maritime spaces and the UN Convention on the law of the sea 1982, [6] inland sea, territorial sea, exclusive economic zone and continental shelf. This term is used in the Ilulissat Declaration of 2008 [7] supported by five Arctic States (Denmark, Canada, Norway, Russia and the United States) devoted to the questions of the marine Arctic "the Ilulissat declaration"». In the second group are included Finland, Sweden and Iceland as well. The Declaration on the establishment of the Arctic Council states that these eight countries are members of the Arctic Council since 1996. It was also adopted by the eight countries mentioned above.

From the historical point of view, the acquisition of the Arctic was being accompanied by the legal registration of the process, where initially governing was carried out only de-facto. This registration was carried out through the publication of regulations, the purpose of which was determined the national status of specific territories, the legal regime of certain activities within the limits. For a long time the Arctic region was being inaccessible for ships of other States. As a result, we can conclude that coastal countries have special rights and their own interests, as a consequence of the practice in the development of the region.

The Arctic polar sector is the space within the established lines drawn from the North pole to the Northern land borders of this state. According to the concept of polar sectors it is considered to be recognized that an integral part of the territory of a state, the coast of which goes to the Arctic ocean, are the lands, including the lands of the Islands, North of the mainland coast of such a state within the sector formed by the coast and meridians converging at the point of the Northern geographical pole and passing through the Western and Eastern extremities of such a coast. In this sector the relevant Arctic state realizes certain target jurisdiction (primarily for protection the extremely vulnerable Arctic environment, biodiversity conservation, ecosystem balance). In the legal literature in this regard, it is stated: "the main principle in solving the problem of the legal regime of the Arctic should be considered a sectoral principle" [8].

It is worth noting that the boundaries of the Arctic sectors should not be considered as state borders, the establishment of which is implied in accordance with the Convention "on territorial waters and the adjacent zone" in 1958. It is necessary to understand that the sector is a zone for the

realization of historically established rights, defense, economic, nature-resource, nature protection interests of a particular Arctic state.

The latest trend is considered to be that the Arctic should be in the free use zone of all States, as the heritage of mankind. The given trend can be explained from the position that some countries that do not have influence in the Arctic region or influence does not satisfy their national interests are ready by any means to get at least some of the hidden resources. Such requirements arise from the understanding that the process of depletion of the hydrocarbon deposit is nearing and it is necessary to look for new ways to extract it.

The sectoral division of the Arctic spaces by the US position was supported by legal science. American lawyer D. Miller had substantiated reasons for the benefits of sectoral division macro-region. Miller believes that the establishment of the legal framework for the division into Arctic sectors for the United States is the Convention between Russia and Great Britain of 1825 the contract of purchase and sale of territories of Russia and the United States, where the sectoral boundaries of the United States are established: the laws of Canada and the Convention of 1825 on the Eastern side of Alaska and on the West side of the Alaska Treaty between America and Russia of 1867. The final delimitation of these spaces was fixed " in Article #2 Of the agreement of the USA and the USSR on June 1, 1990, on the line of delimitation of Maritime spaces specifying its passage.

The sectoral division of the Arctic spaces by the US position was supported by legal science. American lawyer D. Miller substantiated the reasons for the benefits of a sectoral division of the macroregion. Miller believes that the establishment of a legal basis for the division into Arctic sectors for the United States is a convention between Russia and the United Kingdom in 1825, as well as a contract for the sale of territories of Russia and the United States, according to the contract the US sectoral boundaries were established: Canada's legislation and the 1825 convention on the east side of Alaska, and from the western side of Alaska the treaty of America and Russia in 1867. The final demarcation of these spaces was enshrined "in Article #2 of the Agreement of the United States and the USSR on June 1, 1990, on the line of demarcation of maritime areas specifying its passage.

Despite the seemingly established system of work, the next steps of the USA towards the Arctic were contradictory. The US officially declared its disagreement with the sectoral division of the Arctic region. The United States opposes Canada in realizing its rights in the Arctic. The "big brother" is putting pressure on Canada, and is trying to change its attitude to the sectoral principle, which will allow the US to reduce the risk of legal dependence on Canada in the Arctic macroregion.

US national interests in the Arctic. The "Cold War" became an outset of US strategic interests in the Arctic. At present the economic

significance of the Arctic for the United States is increasing. A lot of activity comes from Chevron, Exxon-Mobil, Conoco-Phillips, Royal Dutch Shell, Statoil, Shell, ConocoPhillips. Also, we see that the Italian oil and gas company Eni received permission from US President Donald Trump's administration to drill in the American part of the Arctic Ocean.

We formed America's interests in the Arctic in three groups: 1) military-strategic. (the creation of a missile defense system, the development of tools for the transfer of military contingent to the Arctic, marine operations). The United States is ready to act unilaterally to implement its national interests. 2) internal security. (prevention of terrorist acts or other criminal acts in the Arctic region). This paragraph provides an explanation for Washington's desire to legitimately pursue military policy in the region. 3) politico-economic (demonstration of maritime power and economic benefits). The US will "beneficial" control over the territory of interest

Trend for rivalry. In its report, the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) states that despite of signed documents on cooperation in the Arctic region by the Nordic countries (the agreements in Illulisate 2008, the agreement in Nuuk 2011), all states clearly defined the boundaries of their national interests in Arctic strategy within the state. It was announced about a permanent military presence, the creation of military infrastructure in the Arctic to ensure the security of national interests.

The CSIS report further notes that it is not clear yet which international institutions will solve the problems of collective security in the region. Despite the aforementioned theses, the American establishment maintains the position that the Arctic Council should be maintained as a forum for discussion, and in case of escalation of conflict situations, decisions should be transferred to the global level. And this is beneficial for the US because their authority at the international level is higher and they will feel free to act. Although Washington did not ratify the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea and cannot participate effectively enough in the work of the Arctic Council, including discussion. America puts forward the intention to take an active approach and develop an international security system in the Arctic region, but the US does not want to lose its free position. The Arctic Policy Directive of January 12, 2009 states that "in the Arctic, the US has broad fundamental interests in the sphere of national security and is ready to act independently or in union with other states to protect these interests" [9]. In other words, the US is ready to act unilaterally.

At the domestic political level the United States established interdepartmental institutions to coordinate Arctic policy. This is the Arctic Policy Group in the State Department, which represents the US position in the Arctic Council. Another organization is the Operational Group on

Ocean Policy subordinated to the Council for Environmental Quality in the Office of the President of the United States, which oversees marine and oceanic routes. Under the National Security Council, an Interdepartmental Committee on Arctic Policy has been established, which oversees the US Arctic policy as a whole [10].

As an institutional basis for the international Arctic security policy the United States continues to nominate NATO as the most "natural" candidate and opposes clearly an alliance to the Arctic Council the United States is much less influential there. The argument boils down to the fact that four of the five Arctic states (except Russia) that have access to the Arctic Ocean are already members of NATO. The NATO zone of responsibility has already transcended the European continent and the Arctic has become an important security factor. This position was officially expressed by former NATO Secretary General Skeffer, who called on the members of the alliance to make this organization the main instrument for ensuring security in the Arctic [11], [12].

Conclusion:

1. The relations between the States in the Arctic region are friendly.
2. America does not agree with the division into Arctic sectors.
- 3 the US is pursuing an aggressive policy against the Arctic.
4. Russia is a competitor in the Arctic for the United States.
5. The us hopes for NATO's help in resolving conflicts in the Arctic.
6. America has a leading position in international relations, and does not want to give up these positions in the Arctic.

REFERENCES:

1. Barsegov Yu. G., Korzun V. A., Mogilevkin I. M. Arktika: interesy Rossii I mezhdunarodnye usloviya ih realizatsii [Arctic: Russian interests and international conditions for their implementation]. Moscow, 2002. (In Russ.)
2. Arkticheskiy region: problem mezhdunarodnogo sotrudnichestva [The Arctic region: problems of international cooperation: Hrest. volume 3.] Russian. advice on inter. cases. Moscow, 2013. (In Russ.)
3. Diakonov M. A Istoriya ekspeditsiy v polyarnye strany. The history of expeditions to the polar countries. Arkhangelsk, 1938. (In Russ.)
4. Poval L. M. Mezhdunarodno-pravovye problem razdela ekonomicheskikh prostranstv Arktiki [International legal problems of division of economic spaces of the Arctic]. Moscow, 2011. Available at: <https://regnum.ru/news/1449911.html> (accessed 26. 05. 2018). (In Russ.)
5. Zhenevskie konventsii po morskomu pravu [Geneva conventions on the law of the sea 1958].US, 2010. Available at: http://legal.un.org/avl/pdf/ha/gclos/gclos_r.pdf. (accessed 26. 05. 2018). (In Russ.)
6. Konventsiya Organizatsii Obedinyennykh Natsiy po morskomu pravu [United Nations Convention on the law of the sea]. Moscow, 1982. Available at: http://www.un.org/depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/unclos_r.pdf. (accessed 26. 05. 2018). (In Russ.)

7. Illusiatskaya deklaratsiya [The Ilulissat declaration]. Greenland, 2008. Available at: http://www.oceanlaw.org/downloads/arctic/Ilulissat_Declaration.pdf. (accessed 26. 05. 2018). (In Russ.)
8. Lazarev M. I. Sovremennoe mezhdunarodnoe morskoe pravo. Rezhim vod I dna Mirovogo okeana [Modern international law of the sea. Regime of waters and seabed of the world ocean]. Moscow, 1974. (In Russ.)
9. Konyshchikov V. N., Sergunin A. A. Voennaya strategiya SSHA v Arktike I natsionalnaya bezopasnost Rossii [USA military strategy in the Arctic and national security of Russia]. Moscow, 2014. No. 20. (In Russ.)
10. Konyshchikov V. N., Sergunin A. A. Arkticheskaya strategiya SSHA I natsionalnye interesy Rossii [Arctic strategy of the USA and national interests of Russia]. Moscow, 2012. No. 48. (In Russ.)
11. Biryukov A. A., Zabrodin V. G. Arkticheskiy region: upravlenie I kompleksnaya bezopasnost (obzor aktualnykh voprosov) [The Arctic region: governance and integrated security (review of current issues)]. Moscow, 2015. №3 (26). (In Russ.)
12. Matveenko Yu. I., Galimullin E. Z. Rossiya I SSHA v Arkticheskom regione: sopernichestvo ili strategicheskoe partnerstvo? [Russia and the United States in the Arctic region: competition or strategic partnerships?]. Nizhny Novgorod, 2017. No. 1. (In Russ.)